1	David A. Bahr (Oregon Bar No. 90199)									
2	Bahr Law Offices, P.C. 1035 ½ Monroe Street									
3	Eugene, OR 97402									
	(541) 556-6439									
4	davebahr@mindspring.com									
5	Kristin Henry (California Bar. No. 220908)									
6	Sierra Club Environmental Law Program 85 Second St., 2nd Floor									
7	San Francisco, CA 94105									
8	(415) 977-5716 Kristin.Henry@Sierraclub.org									
9	Attorneys for Plaintiffs									
10										
11	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT									
12	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION									
	SANTRANCI	SCO DIVISION								
13	THE SIERRA CLUB and ENVIRONMENTAL	Case No. C-11-0846-MEJ								
14	INTEGRITY PROJECT,	JOINT MOTION TO EXTEND THE								
15	Plaintiffs,	SUMMARY JUDGMENT REPLY BRIEF								
16	vs.	DEADLINE; DECLARATION OF COUNSEL; [PROPOSED] ORDER								
17	UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL									
18	PROTECTION AGENCY,									
	Defendant.									
19										
20	Pursuant to this Court's Order granting Plair	ntiffs' Unopposed Motion To Extend The Summary								
21										
22	Judgment Reply Brief Deadline, Dkt. 40, Plaintiffs' summary judgment reply brief is due today, May 1,									
23	2012. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b), all Parties now move for a modest enlargement									
24	of time until Friday, May 4, 2012, in which Plaintiffs are to file their summary judgment reply brief.									
25	This motion is supported by the Declaration of Counsel incorporated into this document. <i>Infra</i> .									
26	A district court's decision regarding an extension of time lies well within its discretion. <i>United</i>									
27	States ex rel. Hawaiian Rock Prods. Corp. v. A.E. Lopez Enters., 74 F.3d 972, 976 (9 th Cir.1996) (estab-									
28	Sitiles ex rei. пашинан коск Froas. Corp. v. A.E. L	opez Emers., 14 F.3u 9/2, 9/0 (9 CIF.1990) (estab-								
	IODIT MOTION TO EXTEND THE CHAMARY	I DALID LAW OFFICEG D.C.								

lishing that such a decision will not be disturbed absent an abuse of discretion).

For the following reasons, the all Parties assert good cause exists to grant this request for an enlargement of time.

- 1. By email with a date/time stamp of 10:04 am, May 1, 2012, Plaintiffs' counsel David Bahr, received notice from plaintiff Sierra Club, that it had received a large volume of records released by EPA in response to the FOIA request that is the subject of this suit.
- 2. Plaintiffs' counsel had been entirely unaware that this release was pending.
- **3.** In a telephone conversation with Mr. Bahr, EPA's trial counsel, Abraham Simmons, stated that he was similarly unaware that this release was pending.
- **4.** Based on counsels' initial review of the EPA's cover letter and a declaration of a Luminant employee, it appears that this release constitutes 183 pdf files totaling approximately 6,000 pages of material.
- **5.** Based on counsels' initial review of the EPA's cover letter and a declaration of a Luminant employee, it appears that the information in at least some of these documents is responsive to claims and defenses asserted by the Parties in this case.
- **6.** The Parties require a brief period to evaluate the contents of the recently released records and Plaintiffs require time in which to evaluate their relevance to arguments to be presented in their summary judgment reply.
- 7. This request will not unreasonably delay final disposition of this case. The summary judgment argument date was recently continued by a week until May 17, 2012. Dkt. # 38.
- **8.** No party will be disadvantaged by this enlargement of time. If this motion is granted, with the recent continuance of the argument date, the parties and the Court will actu-

ally have	same amour	t of time	between th	e filing	of the r	eply brie	ef and th	he hearing	g as
under the	schedule pr	eviously a	approved by	the Co	ourt, dkt	t. # 31, (1	13 days).	

- **9.** This is the Parties' first joint request for an enlargement of time in which to brief summary judgment in this case.
- **10.** This request for enlargement is made in good faith and for no improper purpose.

WHEREFORE, the Parties respectfully request the Court to enlarge Plaintiffs' time to file their summary judgment reply brief until May 4, 2012.

Respectfully submitted for the Court's consideration, this 1st day of May, 2012.

s/ David Bahr
David Bahr (Oregon Bar No. 901990)
Bahr Law Offices, P.C.
1035 ½ Monroe Street
Eugene, OR 97402
(541) 556-6439
davebahr@mindspring.com

s/ Abraham A. Simmons
ABRAHAM A. SIMMONS
Assistant United States Attorney
Attorney for the Federal Defendants
450 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor
San Francisco, California 94102-3495
Telephone: (415) 436-7264

Facsimile: (415) 436-6748

Email: abraham.simmons@usdoj.gov

DECLARATION OF COUNSEL

- **1.** My name is David Bahr. I am Plaintiffs' lead counsel in this case. This declaration is based on my personal knowledge and experience.
- **2.** By email with a date/time stamp of 10:04 am, May 1, 2012, I received notice from plaintiff Sierra Club, that it had received a large volume of records released by EPA in response to the FOIA re-

4

7

13

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26

27

28

3. I had been entirely unaware that this release was pending.

quest that is the subject of this suit.

- 4. In a telephone conversation with me, EPA's counsel trial counsel, Abraham Simmons, stated that he was similarly unaware that this release was pending.
- **5.** Based on counsels' initial review of the EPA's cover letter and a declaration of a Luminant employee, it appears that this release constitutes 183 pdf files totaling approximately 6,000 pages of material.
- 6. Based on counsels' initial review of the EPA's cover letter and a declaration of a Luminant employee, it appears that the information in at least some of these documents is responsive to claims and defenses asserted by the Parties in this case.
- 7. The Parties require a brief period to evaluate the contents of the recently released records and Plaintiffs require time in which to evaluate their relevance to arguments to be presented in their summary judgment reply.
- This is the Parties' first joint request for an enlargement of time in which to brief sum-8. mary judgment in this case.
- 9. This request for enlargement is made in good faith and for no improper purpose. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 1st day of May, 2012, in Eugene, Oregon.

s/ David Bahr

David Bahr (Oregon Bar No. 901990) Bahr Law Offices, P.C. 1035 ½ Monroe Street Eugene, OR 97402 (541) 556-6439 davebahr@mindspring.com

Presented by:

s/ David Bahr David Bahr (Oregon Bar No. 901990) Plaintiffs' counsel

s/ Abraham A. Simmons ABRAHAM A. SIMMONS Assistant United States Attorney Attorney for the Federal Defendants